



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

16. Just now it is announced from Washington that an agreement has been reached by which all the difficulties between this country and Canada are to be submitted to a commission which shall take them under consideration and settle them.

Thus we have sixteen cases in progress or newly referred during the past year. This is a fact of the foremost importance, when you remember that only a hundred years ago such things were unknown. It proves two things; first, that the sense of international unity, of the common interests of nations, the sense of international justice and respect, is growing every year, and that international hostility and dislike are gradually being pushed more and more into the background. It proves that the same regard for law which we find in civil society is forcing itself into the relations of the nations of the world; and that it is only a question of time that these principles shall extend their sway and bring about the establishment of that permanent tribunal which some of the gentlemen were discussing here last year.

It proves, in the second place, the necessity of a speedy establishment of an international tribunal, for which we plead, in order that there may not be delay, but that all such disputes may go as a matter of course to a court which is already in existence.

We stand thus on a firm historic basis, while we are convinced in our judgments that international arbitration ought to take the place of the evil of war between all the nations of the world. We are here to try to help the movement along a little. I believe the discussions which we are to have in this conference, and the declaration which we may make will do something towards the fuller development of this splendid system of international justice, and bringing about the time when law, reason and conscience are to prevail in international relations.

Let us not be discouraged. Let us be like the coral polyps. Their business is not with the storm which may pass over them. Though the storm break away something of what they have built or tear some of them loose and destroy their lives, still the great body build on and on day after day. It is their business to be building. Our business as an Arbitration Conference is to build arbitration. The war is not our affair, not primarily. The method of the Master should be our method, to seek the abiding principles, and to dwell upon them. He never said much about the subject of war; he talked about the great principles which were to take their place in human society and ultimately banish war and all other evils. We shall move much faster if we proceed upon the principle of building up the good rather than continually railing at the evil. We should seek to promote the principles of peace and arbitration in the home, in the school, between all sorts of organizations in the country, between this nation and Great Britain, between this nation and all the nations of the world. In this way our purpose is sure to be accomplished in the end.

Let us steadily press the idea that the arbitration movement is a world-movement. It does not have in view simply a union between this country and our great sister nation on the other side of the water. It does not mean an alliance of force with any nation whatever. It means a pacific union, in a spirit of international friendliness, which is to take in all the nations as fast as

possible. Let this conference use its influence to maintain in this nation, as far as it may, the spirit of absolute justice and fairness, of love and brotherhood, toward all other nations. That is our mission, and the strength of our influence will be in proportion to the singleness of aim, the sincerity and honesty with which we pursue it.

The Vital Principle in Arbitration.

BY HERBERT WELSH.

It is very important, my friends, for those who are approaching a new and apparently complicated subject for the first time, and who feel its immensity, to try a simple method of making the question before them easy. It is to try to seek the vital principle back of the machinery. No matter how broad the subject, or how complicated its machinery, the vital principle behind it, if it be a real thing, unites it to truth in other branches of human effort.

We are approaching thus this great subject of international arbitration. Many of us come into this room doubtful as to its value, uncertain how far they can trust to its hand to guide them to definite conclusions. Let us try to touch it with this test. What is international arbitration? Is it not, after all, the application to international affairs of the very spirit which has invited us to meet here on this mountain-top? The principle which has brought us here was the principle of love, and the belief that in the vital principle of love there was a wider possibility than the majority of men have yet recognized.

A few years ago, in the city of Philadelphia, we were threatened by a very serious conflict. On one side stood a great corporation which was engaged in transporting persons in the trolley cars over our streets. On the other side stood a body of workmen. There was a conflict between these two, into the details of which it is not necessary to go; it was a divergence of opinion as to rights. Pardon me if I touch upon it in a somewhat personal way for it illustrates my thought better than I could otherwise do. My own brother happened to be the head of the trolley car company. I was the editor of a small weekly journal which had undertaken to discuss the question of public rights. I could not refrain from pointing out what seemed to me right,—namely, that arbitration must be resorted to in order to settle the difficulty, that there must be some concessions on both sides to bring about the possibility of a meeting on common ground, if we were to avoid armed conflict in our city. In fact, it came to a point where the street-cars were stoned by the workmen, where murder was actually committed, and where United States troops were held a short distance outside the city ready to apply armed force. And yet, forced forward by conviction, our little paper was obliged to speak its mind. It was a delicate family situation. But we did come to the time when the contending parties were willing to accept arbitration, and the result of standing out for that principle was a justification of the theory upon which we had acted.

Out of that incident a great lesson came: that precisely when passion is hot, when violence is actually seeking to assert itself, even then it is possible to stand up for this divine principle of consideration and love; that it is not impracticable; that it is the most practical of all things, and that the best possible results will come from it. It is a question of being able to curb your own passion, to

abate your own claims as to your rights, and to submit them to some outside arbitration which shall determine them. It is the virtue of humility asserting its claims for the first time in the international relationship. You claim that your own honor is violated; but there is something higher than this low and imperfect notion of honor,—it is the welfare of the world, the honor and the majesty of law, which are to be asserted even though your own honor may seem to suffer a temporary eclipse.

So it was when a conflict was threatened, only two years ago, between Great Britain and the United States, upon the issue of the Venezuela message. There was hot blood upon our side of the Atlantic,—far more hot blood, I am bound to say, than upon the other side. Some of us in Philadelphia, as in other cities, made an appeal for an international court of arbitration to guard against similar dangers in the future. From the old State House, out of which, more than a century before, had gone the declaration of our independence from the tyranny of the king of Great Britain,—out of that venerable historic building went the declaration of amity and peace. As in imagination we followed the message across the Atlantic, it seemed to mark a steady advance of law, outside the old sphere in which it has triumphed, outside of the sphere in which we have recognized and honored it so long, into the new sphere of international relationships. But it is simply the wider application of that divine principle, “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.” Back of all the machinery which the learned men must determine,—the lawyers and the thinkers,—back of that is this spirit which must be in men’s hearts. In proportion as that spirit comes in, will the operation of the law become possible.

It was my duty, sent from that Philadelphia conference, to see a number of gentlemen in England the same summer. I had the pleasure of meeting with Mr. James Bryce, a distinguished member of the Liberal party, now a member of Parliament, and the author of “*The American Commonwealth*”; with Cardinal Vaughan, and Canon Scott-Holland, and Mr. Massingham, the editor of the *London Chronicle*,—the newspaper which has been, as you know, most friendly with the United States. The sentiment which these men represented, and which seemed almost universal in England, was one of astonishment and perplexity that there could be in the United States any hostile feeling toward Great Britain. There are good historic reasons why such hostile feeling might linger; but I am sure that in England that feeling has completely passed away, and in the place of it is an earnest desire that all questions of irritation and difficulty coming up between the two nations in the future may be settled in some reasonable and peaceful way.

I hold in my hand a little book* which gives an account of the effort to settle the Alabama case in 1865 by arbitration. This brief history is full of the kind of encouragement that has been given us by Dr. Trueblood this morning. Mr. Thomas Balch of Philadelphia, I believe, was the first to propose that this method should be adopted for the settlement of the Alabama claims;—at least he had great influence in that direction. In 1864 he called upon President Lincoln and urged his proposal. That wise man said to him in reply that the feeling at that time, existing between Great Britain and the United

States, was so bitter that not until the millennium came would it be possible to have arbitration under such circumstances. And yet arbitration was in reality obtained, and what were the results? These two great nations, representing in many respects the most advanced ideas of humanity, settled a trouble which was most serious in its character by an absolutely peaceful method. It is of interest to know that Mr. Balch was charged at that time in the United States with a lack of patriotism for making this proposition.

When we look back upon such facts, are we not greatly encouraged to follow out these suggestions which have been made here—to remember that this question is to be approached by most simple and natural methods. The solution of the question is not to be found in the presentation of an ideal legal method in constituting the court of arbitration. That question is most important; but back of that and underneath it is the existence of a public sentiment which will make the thing possible. In the existence of such sentiment lies the possibility of the operation of such a court. Every man and every woman must remember that we are all commissioned to carry forward this work, by trying to feel, in moments of passion, at the very instant when we are tempted to use the other method, that it is possible to keep our minds calm and cool and that before we are committed to a contrary policy, we must try this method. Is this thought not best illustrated, after all, by the conflict which one man has with another over some disputed question, when each maintains that he is right? Unless there be a court to go into, unless there be an arbitration tribunal of some kind to appeal to, there is no way to settle the matter but by an appeal to violence. Our efforts must be to push the nation up into the sphere of morality and righteousness, which the individual has very largely reached and towards which nations more or less blindly aspire. It is by our personal efforts that the ape and the tiger in the nations is to be made to die. Each one of us must feel that God commissions us, not only to carry this method of peace into our personal relations, but to try and press it forward into international relations. Only thus can solid progress be effected.

One who travels on the Continent or in England,—does he not feel how, in personal knowledge of and personal contact with the persons whom he meets, in railway carriages and elsewhere, the humanity of these people comes nearer and nearer to him, and misapprehensions and national hates fostered by ignorance are very largely removed through acquaintanceship? Those who have friends in Germany, in Russia, in France or other foreign countries know that there are many noble people in those countries, who would welcome arbitration as readily as the people of Great Britain. So I wish heartily to emphasize this idea: that what we seek in trying to bring about a court of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States is not the attainment of a selfish purpose. It is simply as a practical expedient that we seek first that. What we really want is to establish reason and justice and self-restraint in our dealings with all people, to make those relations such as the gospel of Christ would dictate. We can hasten that by coming into closer contact with them. We can do it by trying to approach any question of international difficulty, not with the idea of physical strength to enforce our demand, but with the thought of the justice and right back of our demand. We can do

**International Courts of arbitration*, By Thomas Balch, 1874. Reprinted at Philadelphia, Allen, Lane and Scott, 1896.

it by learning, in the national sense, to love others. Even if we were dealing with a nation like Turkey, we can feel that if we could only go to the individual Turk, free from the domination of the false ideals in which he has been brought up, we should find it possible to love the humanity in him, and by treating him justly to lift him to our own plane of living. Nothing has done more for my own education in this respect than contact with our Indian tribes,—a people at one time apparently outlawed from human sympathies, and looked upon as cruel, treacherous and bad. And yet knowledge of them shows that they too are made in the image of God, and that principles of justice and right in dealing with them will bring out splendid results. Shall we not, then, take this gospel, and spread it in all our communication with our fellow beings? Shall we not try to use our influence more and more to make the spirit of our nation the spirit of peace, and her dealings with other nations the fruit of this spirit? Shall not that be the highest and noblest idea for which the flag really stands?

Signs of Promise.

BY REV. W. H. P. FAUNCE, D.D.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,—There are some signs of promise along the horizon which give us all good cheer.

One of the genuine signs of promise is the shrinking of the globe, through the progress of modern discovery and invention. I am not sure whether those “kite-flying machines” will banish war or not; it is a very interesting line of thought as to what they may do. They may take the dare-to-fight out of man; they cannot take the want-to-fight out of him. We are striving to do the latter as well as the former.

The shrinking of the globe, the drawing together of the nations, produces a physical contiguity which must have profound moral results. When General Washington went from Philadelphia to assume the command of the continental army at Boston, he was eleven days in making the journey,—a time which would now suffice to place an ambassador in most of the distant nations of the earth. When Livingstone died in the heart of Africa, it was after an absence from civilization, a practical dropping out of the world, for years. Now anyone in this room can send a telegram straight to the tree beneath which Livingstone's heart is buried. The maps of to-day are so rapidly being changed, and so marvellously, that the atlas of to-night will be practically useless at the opening of the twentieth century. We see Africa being portioned out; we see China being carved into gigantic morsels for the European palate. We see Nansen making his dash for the pole. We see the trans-continental Siberian railway carrying new life into those frozen desolations, and soon to pour the tide of European civilization into the ports of the Pacific. And this physical contiguity,—have we ever considered what it means, as regards temperamental and social and moral relations? What does it mean for men to come geographically nearer if politically and socially they are farther apart? What does it mean for men to come into greater physical proximity if they are sundered more vitally in their thoughts and ideals and aspirations? This physical nearness, on which I surely need not enlarge, means this: that in the future hatred will be more awful, strife more

frightfully disastrous, war more exceedingly terrible, peace more practicable, international amity and unity more absolutely essential, than in any century since the morning stars sang together at the creation.

Another sign of promise is the wonderful expansion of the self-consciousness of our own republic, and its frank recognition of its place among the family of nations. The first essential in the individual life is that the boy shall become strong in his own personality. The first essential is that the baby shall learn the use of “I” and “me.” First the infant must learn to walk alone and talk alone and think alone and act alone; then come those alliances with other lives, that interlacing with other personalities, out of which comes the richest and ripest part of our life. First the assertion and maintenance of one's own self, then the intertwining with other selves. So, if you ask: “Why has this great movement not before aroused the conscience of America, why was it not taken up fifty or seventy-five years ago?”—the answer is plain. First in America we had not only to declare but to achieve ourselves; first we had to achieve our own place among the nations of the earth. Now comes this larger intertwining of our national life with all the family of nations, without which our own highest well-being can never be achieved. In the history of the invention of printing, if I may borrow a happy illustration from Seth Low, progress was slow as long as the letters of a word were all printed on one block. When each movable type became absolutely independent and separate from all its fellows, then their endless combinations in modern literature and modern printing became for the first time possible. First of all it was given to this country to have the great rallying cry of 1776, Independence. Now we are coming to the grander rallying cry, because the grander idea, of Inter-dependence,—the inter-dependence of separate sovereign states, each independent in its own domain, yet all coming together in one indivisible family of nations. This, I think, is one inevitable outcome of the present tendencies and events.

Another sign of promise on the horizon is that we are now coming to recognize that the ethics of Jesus, always accepted as the supreme standard of individual righteousness, is now becoming recognized as the supreme standard of national righteousness as well. Hatred on a national scale is far more unchristian than hatred on a personal scale. Alexander Selkirk, on his lonely island, could not have been, in the deepest sense of the term, a Christian. He could of course have prayed to God and have been saved in the hereafter; but to be a Christian is very much more than that. Nine-tenths of all Christ's commands relate to our duties to our fellows, to our relations to one another; and the man who, voluntarily or involuntarily, is isolated from his fellows, cannot achieve Christianity in the real sense. The same thing is true of the nation: a nation shutting itself within its own boundaries, and saying, “We care nothing for the rest of the world, they are only our enemies,” is a nation that cannot be in the deepest sense of the term a Christian nation. How much we have to be thankful for, that the ethics of Jesus has already ameliorated the conditions of modern warfare! When, just a month ago, we issued two declarations to the world;—first, that if we go into war it shall not be for conquest and personal aggrandizement; and secondly, it shall not be to let loose a host of privateers upon our foes;—something was shown to the world which would